arXiv:cond-mat/0109029v1 3 Sep 2001

Yang-Baxter Equation for the R-matrix of 1-D SU(n) Hubbard Model

Dan-tao Peng[a] * Rui-hong Yue[a,b] †

[a]Institute of Modern Physics, Northwest University
Xi'an, 710069, P. R. China
[b]Institute of Theoretical Physics, Academica Science
Beijing, 100080, P. R. China

Abstract

Based on the tetrahedral Zamolodchikov algebra, we prove the Yang-Baxter equation for the R-matrix of 1-D $SU(n)$ Hubbard model. Furthermore, we present generalizations of the model.

Keyword: Hubbard model, R-matrix, tetralhedral Zamolodchikov algebra

1 Introduction

The Hubbard model is one of the significant models in the study of strongly correlated electronic systems which might reveal an enlightenning role in understanding the mysteries of the high-T_C superconductivity. The 1-D Hubbard model also favours a lot of properties of integrable models in non-pertubative quantum field theory and mathematical physics. Since Lieb and Wu[1] solved the 1-D Hubbard model by Bethe ansatz method in 1968, based on their results (Lieb and Wu's Bethe ansatz equations), many works[2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14] have been done extensively to clarify the physical properties of this model. Although there were lots of works on the Hubbard model, the integrability was finished until 1986 by Shastry[15], Olmedilla and Wadati[16] in both boson and fermion graded versions. However, the Yang-Baxter equation for the R-matrix of the model obtained by Shastry was proved until 1995 by Shiroishi and Wadati in Refs. [31, 32, 33] and a generalization of the Shastry's bilayer vertex model was also presented in [31]. Moreover, the eigenvalue of the

*Email:dtpeng@phy.nwu.edu.cn
†Email:yue@phy.nwu.edu.cn

transfer matrix related to the Hubbard model was suggested in Ref. [15] and proved through different methods in Refs. [17, 18].

Based on the knowledge of Lie algebra, Maassarani and Mathieu succeeded in constructing the Hamiltonian of the $SU(n)$ XX model and showed its integrability[22]. Considered two coupled $SU(n)$ XX models, by using Shastry's method, Maassarani constructed the $SU(n)$ Hubbard model[23] and found the related R-matrix which ensures the integrability of the 1-D $SU(n)$ Hubbard model[24]. (It was also proved by Martins for $n = 3, 4$.[25], and by Yue and Sasaki[26] for general n in terms of Lax pair formulism.) The exact Solution of the $SU(3)$ Hubbard model was given in Ref.[27]. But the Yang-Baxter equation for the given R-matrix was not proved.

The main purpose of the present paper is to prove the Yang-Baxter equation for the R-matrix of 1-D $SU(n)$ Hubbard model following method suggested in Ref.[31]. In section 2 we review the model and its integrability. We present the L-operator and the R-matrix of the model and formulate the Yang-Baxter relation. In section 3 we construct the tetrahedral Zamolodchikov algebra related to the $SU(n)$ Hubbard model. The Yang-Baxter equation for the cooresponding R-matrix was proved in section 4 and we also present a generalization of the model in this section. In section 5 we make some conclusion remarks.

2 The 1-D $SU(n)$ Hubbard model and its integrability

The Hamiltonian of the 1-D $SU(n)$ Hubbard model is:

$$H = \sum_{k=1}^{L} \sum_{\alpha=1}^{n-1} (E_{\sigma,k}^{n\alpha} E_{\sigma,k+1}^{\alpha n} + E_{\sigma,k}^{\alpha n} E_{\sigma,k+1}^{n\alpha} + E_{\tau,k}^{n\alpha} E_{\tau,k+1}^{\alpha n} + E_{\tau,k}^{\alpha n} E_{\tau,k+1}^{n\alpha}) + \frac{Un^2}{4} \sum_{k=1}^{L} C_k^{(\sigma)} C_k^{(\tau)}, \quad (1)$$

where U is the Coulumb coupling constant, and $E_{a,k}^{\alpha\beta} (a = \sigma, \tau)$ is a matrix with an one at row α and column β and zeros otherwise:

$$(E^{\alpha\beta})_{lm} = \delta_l^\alpha \delta_m^\beta.$$

The subscripts a and k stand for two different E operators at k-th site ($k = 1, \cdots, L$). The $n \times n$ diagonal matrix C is defined by $C = \sum_{\alpha<n} E^{\alpha\alpha} - E^{nn}$. We also assume the periodic boundary condition: $E_{k+L}^{\alpha\beta} = E_k^{\alpha\beta}$.

In this model, the system has two types of particles named σ and τ respectively, and each particle can occupy $(n-1)$ possible states. The same type of particles can not appear in one site, but two different types of particles can occupy a same site. We denote $|n\rangle_j$ as the vaccum state of j-th site, $|1\rangle_j, |2\rangle_j, \cdots, |n-1\rangle_j$ as the $(n-1)$ possible one particle states of j-th site. Under the following basis:

$$|1\rangle_j = \begin{pmatrix} 1 \\ 0 \\ \vdots \\ 0 \end{pmatrix}_j, |2\rangle_j = \begin{pmatrix} 0 \\ 1 \\ \vdots \\ 0 \end{pmatrix}_j, \cdots, |n-1\rangle_j = \begin{pmatrix} 0 \\ \vdots \\ 1 \\ 0 \end{pmatrix}_j, |n\rangle_j = \begin{pmatrix} 0 \\ \vdots \\ 0 \\ 1 \end{pmatrix}_j,$$

It could be easily proved that: $E_j^{\alpha n}|n\rangle_j = |\alpha\rangle_j, E_j^{n\alpha}|n\rangle_j = 0, E_j^{n\alpha}|\alpha\rangle_j = |n\rangle_j, E_j^{n\alpha}|n\rangle_j = 0$. This means that the operators $E^{\alpha n}$ and $E^{n\alpha}$ can be interpreted as the particle creation and annihilation operators respectively. $E_j^{\alpha n}$ can create a $|\alpha\rangle_j$ state particle over the vaccum state $|n\rangle_j$ of j-th site, and $E_j^{n\alpha}$ annihilate a $|\alpha\rangle_j$ state particle to vaccum state of j-th site.

The $SU(n)$ Hubbard model is constructed by considering two coupled $SU(n)$ XX model, so the Hamiltonian (1) consists of two $SU(n)$ XX model with an interation term between them. The Hamiltonian of the $SU(n)$ XX model is:

$$H_{XX} = \sum_{k=1}^{L}\sum_{\alpha=1}^{n-1}(E_k^{n\alpha}E_{k+1}^{\alpha n} + E_k^{\alpha n}E_{k+1}^{n\alpha}), \tag{2}$$

and the corresponding R-matrix is:

$$\begin{aligned} R(\lambda) &= a(\lambda)[E^{nn}\otimes E^{nn} + \sum_{\alpha,\beta<n} E^{\alpha\beta}\otimes E^{\beta\alpha}] \\ &\quad + b(\lambda)\sum_{\alpha<n}(xE^{nn}\otimes E^{\alpha\alpha} + x^{-1}E^{\alpha\alpha}\otimes E^{nn}) \\ &\quad + c(\lambda)\sum_{\alpha<n}(E^{n\alpha}E^{\alpha n} + E^{\alpha n}E^{n\alpha}), \end{aligned} \tag{3}$$

where $x = e^{i\delta}$ and $a(\lambda) = \cos(\lambda), b(\lambda) = \sin(\lambda), c(\lambda) = 1$. The functions $a(\lambda), b(\lambda), c(\lambda)$ satisfy the free-fermion relation: $a^2(\lambda) + b^2(\lambda) = c^2(\lambda)$.

The R-matrix of the $SU(n)$ XX model satisfies regularity property $R(0) = P$, unitarity condition $R_{12}(\lambda)R_{21}(-\lambda) = \cos^2(\lambda)Id$ and Yang-Baxter equation (YBE):

$$R_{31}(\lambda_1)R_{32}(\lambda_2)R_{12}(\lambda_2-\lambda_1) = R_{12}(\lambda_2-\lambda_1)R_{32}(\lambda_2)R_{31}(\lambda_1), \tag{4}$$

where P is a permutation operator on the tensor product of two n-dimensional spaces. It is easy to verify that it also satisfies a decorated Yang-Baxter equation (DYBE):

$$R_{31}(\lambda_1)R_{32}(\lambda_2)C_2R_{12}(\lambda_2-\lambda_1) = R_{12}(\lambda_2-\lambda_1)C_2R_{32}(\lambda_2)R_{31}(\lambda_1). \tag{5}$$

For the two $SU(n)$ XX model, the R-matrix without interaction term is given by:

$$\bar{R}_{ij}(\lambda) = R_{ij}^{(\sigma)}(\lambda)R_{ij}^{(\tau)}(\lambda), \tag{6}$$

here $R_{ij}^{(\sigma)}(\lambda)$ and $R_{ij}^{(\tau)}(\lambda)$ denote the R-matrices of two $SU(n)$ XX models. Since both $R_{ij}^{(\sigma)}(\lambda)$ and $R_{ij}^{(\tau)}(\lambda)$ satisfy the YBE and DYBE, the product $\bar{R}_{ij}(\lambda)$ also satsfy the YBE:

$$\bar{R}_{31}(\lambda_1)\bar{R}_{32}(\lambda_2)\bar{R}_{12}(\lambda_2-\lambda_1) = \bar{R}_{12}(\lambda_2-\lambda_1)\bar{R}_{32}(\lambda_2)\bar{R}_{31}(\lambda_1) \tag{7}$$

and DYBE:

$$\bar{R}_{31}(\lambda_1)\bar{R}_{32}(\lambda_2)C_2^{(\sigma)}C_2^{(\tau)}\bar{R}_{12}(\lambda_2-\lambda_1) = \bar{R}_{12}(\lambda_2-\lambda_1)C_2^{(\sigma)}C_2^{(\tau)}\bar{R}_{32}(\lambda_2)\bar{R}_{31}(\lambda_1) \tag{8}$$

A linear combination of (7) and (8) yields:

$$\begin{aligned}&\bar{R}_{31}(\lambda_1)\bar{R}_{32}(\lambda_2)\left\{\alpha\bar{R}_{12}(\lambda_2-\lambda_1)+\beta C_2^{(\sigma)}C_2^{(\tau)}\bar{R}_{12}(\lambda_2+\lambda_1)\right\}\\&=\left\{\alpha\bar{R}_{12}(\lambda_2-\lambda_1)+\beta\bar{R}_{12}(\lambda_2+\lambda_1)C_2^{(\sigma)}C_2^{(\tau)}\right\}\bar{R}_{32}(\lambda_2)\bar{R}_{31}(\lambda_1),\end{aligned}\tag{9}$$

here α and β are combination coefficients and arbitrary.

For the $SU(n)$ Hubbard model, the two coupled $SU(n)$ XX model, we look for a solution of the Yang-Baxter relation (YBR):

$$\mathcal{L}_{31}(\lambda_1)\mathcal{L}_{32}(\lambda_2)R^h_{12}(\lambda_1,\lambda_2)=R^h_{12}(\lambda_1,\lambda_2)\mathcal{L}_{32}(\lambda_2)\mathcal{L}_{31}(\lambda_1)\tag{10}$$

in the form:

$$R^h_{12}(\lambda_1,\lambda_2)=\alpha\bar{R}_{12}(\lambda_2-\lambda_1)+\beta\bar{R}_{12}(\lambda_2+\lambda_1)C_2^{(\sigma)}C_2^{(\tau)},\tag{11}$$

$$\mathcal{L}_{ij}(\lambda)=\bar{R}_{ij}(\lambda)\exp\{h(\lambda)C_j^{(\sigma)}C_j^{(\tau)}\}.\tag{12}$$

Comparing eq.(9) with the Yang-Baxter relation (10), we get a relation:

$$I_1(\lambda_1)I_2(\lambda_2)R^h_{12}(\lambda_1,\lambda_2)I_1^{-1}(\lambda_1)I_2^{-1}(\lambda_2)=\alpha\bar{R}_{12}(\lambda_2-\lambda_1)+\beta C_2^{(\sigma)}C_2^{(\tau)}\bar{R}_{12}(\lambda_2+\lambda_1),\tag{13}$$

where

$$I_j(\lambda)=\exp\{h(\lambda)C_j^{(\sigma)}C_j^{(\tau)}\}.\tag{14}$$

From (13), we have:

$$\begin{aligned}\frac{\beta a(\lambda_2+\lambda_1)c(\lambda_2+\lambda_1)}{\alpha a(\lambda_2-\lambda_1)c(\lambda_2-\lambda_1)}&=\tanh(h(\lambda_2)-h(\lambda_1)),\\\frac{\beta b(\lambda_2+\lambda_1)c(\lambda_2+\lambda_1)}{\alpha b(\lambda_2-\lambda_1)c(\lambda_2-\lambda_1)}&=\tanh(h(\lambda_2)+h(\lambda_1)),\end{aligned}\tag{15}$$

which give the ratio of α and β and constraints on $h(\lambda_1)$ and $h(\lambda_2)$. The constraints can be written in more explicit form [24]:

$$\frac{\sinh(h(\lambda_1))}{\sin(2\lambda_1)}=\frac{\sinh(h(\lambda_2))}{\sin(2\lambda_2)}=\frac{n^2U}{4}.\tag{16}$$

Now we have obtained the R-matrix of the 1-D $SU(n)$ Hubbard model [24]:

$$\begin{aligned}R^h_{12}(\lambda_1,\lambda_2)=\quad&R_{12}^{(\sigma)}(\lambda_2-\lambda_1)R_{12}^{(\tau)}(\lambda_2-\lambda_1)+\frac{\cos(\lambda_2-\lambda_1)}{\cos(\lambda_2+\lambda_1)}\tanh(h(\lambda_2)-h(\lambda_1))\\&\times R_{12}^{(\sigma)}(\lambda_2+\lambda_1)R_{12}^{(\tau)}(\lambda_2+\lambda_1)C_2^{(\sigma)}C_2^{(\tau)}.\end{aligned}\tag{17}$$

which satsify the Yang-Baxter relation (10). This R-matrix depends not only on the diference of the spectral parameters $\lambda_2-\lambda_1$, but also on the sum of the spectral parameters $\lambda_2+\lambda_1$.

This non-additive property allows us to generalize the Hamiltonian of the 1-D $SU(n)$ Hubbard model (see section 4).

The monodromy matrix of the model can be defined as:

$$\mathcal{T}_a(\lambda) = \mathcal{L}_{La}(\lambda)\mathcal{L}_{L-1a}(\lambda)\cdots\mathcal{L}_{1a}(\lambda). \tag{18}$$

From the Yang-Baxter relation (10) we know the monodromy matrix satisfies the global Yang-Baxter relation:

$$\mathcal{T}_1(\lambda_1)\mathcal{T}_2(\lambda_2)R^h_{12}(\lambda_1,\lambda_2) = R^h_{12}(\lambda_1,\lambda_2)\mathcal{T}_2(\lambda_2)\mathcal{T}_1(\lambda_1). \tag{19}$$

The corresponding transfer matrix is defined by:

$$\tau(\lambda) = tr_a[\mathcal{T}_a(\lambda)] \tag{20}$$

and from (19) it can be easily proved the existence of a commuting family of transfer matrices

$$[\tau(\lambda_1),\tau(\lambda_2)] = 0. \tag{21}$$

Then the integrability of the model was proved.

Using the relation $h(0) = 0$ and $h'(0) = \frac{n^2U}{4}$ we can obtain the Hamiltonian of the 1-D $SU(n)$ Hubbard model (1):

$$\begin{aligned} H &= \frac{d}{d\lambda}\ln\tau(\lambda)|_{\lambda=0} = \tau^{-1}(0)\frac{d}{d\lambda}\tau(\lambda)|_{\lambda=0} \\ &= \sum_{k=1}^{L}\sum_{\alpha=1}^{n-1}(E^{n\alpha}_{\sigma,k}E^{\alpha n}_{\sigma,k+1} + E^{\alpha n}_{\sigma,k}E^{n\alpha}_{\sigma,k+1} + E^{n\alpha}_{\tau,k}E^{\alpha n}_{\tau,k+1} + E^{\alpha n}_{\tau,k}E^{n\alpha}_{\tau,k+1}) \\ &\quad + \frac{Un^2}{4}\sum_{k=1}^{L} C^{(\sigma)}_k C^{(\tau)}_k. \end{aligned} \tag{22}$$

3 Tetrahedral Zamolodchikov algebra

In the above section we have shown the integrability of the 1-D $SU(n)$ Hubbard model. It is natrual to expect that the R-matrix (17) itself satisfy the Yang-Baxter equation(YBE):

$$R^h_{31}(\lambda_3,\lambda_1)R^h_{32}(\lambda_3,\lambda_1)R^h_{12}(\lambda_1,\lambda_1) = R^h_{12}(\lambda_1,\lambda_2)R^h_{32}(\lambda_3,\lambda_2)R^h_{31}(\lambda_3,\lambda_1). \tag{23}$$

In the $SU(2)$ case, the YBE of the R-matrix was proved in ref.[31] by using the tetrahedral Zemolodchikov algebra (TZA) [34, 33]. In this section, we construct the TZA related to the $SU(n)$ Hubbard model.

The TZA is defined by the following set of relations:

$$\mathcal{L}^a_{12}\mathcal{L}^b_{32}\mathcal{L}^c_{31} = \sum_{def} S^{abc}_{def}\mathcal{L}^f_{31}\mathcal{L}^e_{32}\mathcal{L}^d_{12}. \tag{24}$$

where $a, b, \cdots, f = 0, 1$ and S^{abc}_{def} are some scalar coefficients.

We take $\mathcal{L}^0_{jk}$ and $\mathcal{L}^1_{jk}$ as follows:

$$\mathcal{L}^0_{jk} = R_{jk}(\lambda_k - \lambda_j), \qquad \mathcal{L}^1_{jk} = R_{jk}(\lambda_k + \lambda_j)C_k, \tag{25}$$

where $R_{jk}(\lambda)$ is the R-matrix of the $SU(n)$ XX model as before. Then we could find the following relations which give the TZA (24):

$$\mathcal{L}^0_{12}\mathcal{L}^0_{32}\mathcal{L}^0_{31} = \mathcal{L}^0_{31}\mathcal{L}^0_{32}\mathcal{L}^0_{12}, \qquad \mathcal{L}^0_{12}\mathcal{L}^1_{32}\mathcal{L}^1_{31} = \mathcal{L}^1_{31}\mathcal{L}^1_{32}\mathcal{L}^0_{12}, \tag{26}$$

$$\mathcal{L}^1_{12}\mathcal{L}^1_{32}\mathcal{L}^0_{31} = \mathcal{L}^0_{31}\mathcal{L}^1_{32}\mathcal{L}^1_{12}, \qquad \mathcal{L}^1_{12}\mathcal{L}^0_{32}\mathcal{L}^1_{31} = \mathcal{L}^1_{31}\mathcal{L}^0_{32}\mathcal{L}^1_{12}, \tag{27}$$

$$\mathcal{L}^1_{12}\mathcal{L}^1_{32}\mathcal{L}^1_{31} = S^{111}_{001}\mathcal{L}^1_{31}\mathcal{L}^0_{32}\mathcal{L}^0_{12} + S^{111}_{010}\mathcal{L}^1_{31}\mathcal{L}^0_{32}\mathcal{L}^1_{12} + S^{111}_{100}\mathcal{L}^0_{31}\mathcal{L}^0_{32}\mathcal{L}^1_{12}, \tag{28}$$

$$\mathcal{L}^0_{12}\mathcal{L}^0_{32}\mathcal{L}^1_{31} = S^{001}_{111}\mathcal{L}^1_{31}\mathcal{L}^1_{32}\mathcal{L}^1_{12} + S^{001}_{100}\mathcal{L}^0_{31}\mathcal{L}^0_{32}\mathcal{L}^1_{12} + S^{001}_{010}\mathcal{L}^0_{31}\mathcal{L}^1_{32}\mathcal{L}^0_{12}, \tag{29}$$

$$\mathcal{L}^0_{12}\mathcal{L}^1_{32}\mathcal{L}^0_{31} = S^{010}_{111}\mathcal{L}^1_{31}\mathcal{L}^1_{32}\mathcal{L}^1_{12} + S^{010}_{100}\mathcal{L}^0_{31}\mathcal{L}^0_{32}\mathcal{L}^1_{12} + S^{010}_{001}\mathcal{L}^1_{31}\mathcal{L}^0_{32}\mathcal{L}^0_{12}, \tag{30}$$

$$\mathcal{L}^1_{12}\mathcal{L}^0_{32}\mathcal{L}^0_{31} = S^{100}_{111}\mathcal{L}^1_{31}\mathcal{L}^1_{32}\mathcal{L}^1_{12} + S^{100}_{010}\mathcal{L}^0_{31}\mathcal{L}^1_{32}\mathcal{L}^0_{12} + S^{100}_{001}\mathcal{L}^1_{31}\mathcal{L}^0_{32}\mathcal{L}^0_{12}, \tag{31}$$

where the coefficients S^{abc}_{def} are given by

$$\begin{aligned}
S^{111}_{001} &= \frac{\sin(\lambda_2+\lambda_1)\cos(\lambda_2+\lambda_3)}{\cos(\lambda_2-\lambda_1)\sin(\lambda_2-\lambda_3)}, & S^{111}_{010} &= -\frac{\sin(\lambda_2+\lambda_1)\sin(\lambda_1+\lambda_3)}{\cos(\lambda_2-\lambda_1)\cos(\lambda_1-\lambda_3)},\\
S^{111}_{100} &= -\frac{\sin(\lambda_1+\lambda_3)\cos(\lambda_2+\lambda_3)}{\cos(\lambda_1-\lambda_3)\sin(\lambda_2-\lambda_3)}, & S^{001}_{111} &= \frac{\sin(\lambda_2-\lambda_1)\cos(\lambda_2-\lambda_3)}{\cos(\lambda_2+\lambda_1)\sin(\lambda_2+\lambda_3)},\\
S^{001}_{100} &= \frac{\sin(\lambda_2-\lambda_1)\sin(\lambda_1+\lambda_3)}{\cos(\lambda_2+\lambda_1)\cos(\lambda_1-\lambda_3)}, & S^{001}_{010} &= \frac{\sin(\lambda_1+\lambda_3)\cos(\lambda_2-\lambda_3)}{\cos(\lambda_1-\lambda_3)\cos(\lambda_2+\lambda_3)},\\
S^{010}_{111} &= \frac{\sin(\lambda_2-\lambda_1)\sin(\lambda_1-\lambda_3)}{\cos(\lambda_2+\lambda_1)\cos(\lambda_1+\lambda_3)}, & S^{010}_{100} &= \frac{\sin(\lambda_2-\lambda_1)\cos(\lambda_2+\lambda_3)}{\cos(\lambda_2+\lambda_1)\sin(\lambda_2-\lambda_3)},\\
S^{010}_{001} &= \frac{\sin(\lambda_1-\lambda_3)\cos(\lambda_2+\lambda_3)}{\cos(\lambda_1+\lambda_3)\sin(\lambda_2-\lambda_3)}, & S^{100}_{111} &= -\frac{\sin(\lambda_1-\lambda_3)\cos(\lambda_2-\lambda_3)}{\cos(\lambda_1+\lambda_3)\sin(\lambda_2+\lambda_3)},\\
S^{100}_{010} &= \frac{\sin(\lambda_2+\lambda_1)\cos(\lambda_2-\lambda_3)}{\cos(\lambda_2-\lambda_1)\sin(\lambda_2+\lambda_3)}, & S^{100}_{001} &= -\frac{\sin(\lambda_2+\lambda_1)\sin(\lambda_1-\lambda_3)}{\cos(\lambda_2-\lambda_1)\cos(\lambda_1+\lambda_3)},
\end{aligned} \tag{32}$$

Eq.(26) and eq.(27) are equivalent to the YBE (7) and DYBE (8) respectively. In this sense, the TZA (24) can be regarded as a generalization of the YBE and DYBE.

It is important to notice that the products $\mathcal{L}^a_{12}\mathcal{L}^b_{32}\mathcal{L}^c_{31}$ are not linearly independent as operators acting on $V_1 \otimes V_2 \otimes V_3$ and they satisfy the following relations:

$$\mathcal{L}^0_{12}\mathcal{L}^0_{32}\mathcal{L}^0_{31} = x_0\mathcal{L}^0_{12}\mathcal{L}^1_{32}\mathcal{L}^1_{31} + y_0\mathcal{L}^1_{12}\mathcal{L}^0_{32}\mathcal{L}^1_{31} + z_0\mathcal{L}^1_{12}\mathcal{L}^1_{32}\mathcal{L}^0_{31}, \tag{33}$$

$$\mathcal{L}^1_{12}\mathcal{L}^1_{32}\mathcal{L}^1_{31} = x_1\mathcal{L}^1_{12}\mathcal{L}^0_{32}\mathcal{L}^0_{31} + y_1\mathcal{L}^0_{12}\mathcal{L}^1_{32}\mathcal{L}^0_{31} + z_1\mathcal{L}^0_{12}\mathcal{L}^0_{32}\mathcal{L}^1_{31}, \tag{34}$$

with

$$x_0 = -\frac{\cos(\lambda_1-\lambda_3)\sin(\lambda_2-\lambda_3)}{\cos(\lambda_1+\lambda_3)\sin(\lambda_2+\lambda_3)}, \qquad y_0 = \frac{\cos(\lambda_2-\lambda_1)\cos(\lambda_1-\lambda_3)}{\cos(\lambda_2+\lambda_1)\cos(\lambda_1+\lambda_3)}, \tag{35}$$

$$z_0 = \frac{\cos(\lambda_2-\lambda_1)\sin(\lambda_2-\lambda_3)}{\cos(\lambda_2+\lambda_1)\sin(\lambda_2+\lambda_3)}, \qquad x_1 = -\frac{\cos(\lambda_1+\lambda_3)\sin(\lambda_2+\lambda_3)}{\cos(\lambda_1-\lambda_3)\sin(\lambda_2-\lambda_3)}, \tag{36}$$

$$y_1 = \frac{\cos(\lambda_2+\lambda_1)\cos(\lambda_1+\lambda_3)}{\cos(\lambda_2-\lambda_1)\cos(\lambda_1-\lambda_3)}, \qquad z_1 = \frac{\sin(\lambda_2+\lambda_3)\cos(\lambda_2+\lambda_1)}{\sin(\lambda_2-\lambda_3)\cos(\lambda_2-\lambda_1)}, \tag{37}$$

From these relations we know that the linear space spanned by the products $\mathcal{L}^a_{12}\mathcal{L}^b_{32}\mathcal{L}^c_{31}$ is 6-dimensional.

4 The Yang-Baxter equation for the R-matrix of the $SU(n)$ Hubbard model

In this section we prove the Yang-Baxter equation for the R-matrix of the 1-D $SU(n)$ Hubbard model (23).

Taking into account the form of the R-matrix (17), we look for a solution of the YBE (23) in the following form:

$$\begin{aligned} R^h_{jk}(\lambda_j,\lambda_k) &= R^{(\sigma)}_{jk}(\lambda_k-\lambda_j)R^{(\tau)}_{jk}(\lambda_k-\lambda_j) + \alpha_{jk}R(\sigma)_{jk}(\lambda_k+\lambda_j)C^{(\sigma)}_k R^{(\tau)}_{jk}(\lambda_k+\lambda_j)C^{(\tau)}_k \\ &= \mathcal{L}^{0(\sigma)}_{jk}\mathcal{L}^{0(\tau)}_{jk} + \alpha_{jk}\mathcal{L}^{1(\sigma)}_{jk}\mathcal{L}^{1(\tau)}_{jk}, \end{aligned} \tag{38}$$

where $\mathcal{L}^0_{jk}$ and $\mathcal{L}^1_{jk}$ have been defined in (25). If $\alpha_{jk}=0$, the R-matrix satisfies the YBE (23) in a trivial way. Now we look for a non-trivial solution. Subsitituting the expression (38) into the Yang-Baxter equation (23), by means of the tetralhedral Zamolodchikov algebra and relations (33) and (34), we could find that α_{jk} must satisfy the following conditions:

$$\begin{aligned} &\alpha_{12}\sin 2(\lambda_1+\lambda_2) + \alpha_{31}\sin 2(\lambda_1+\lambda_3) = \alpha_{32}\sin 2(\lambda_2+\lambda_3) \\ &= \frac{1}{\alpha_{31}}\sin 2(\lambda_3-\lambda_1) + \frac{1}{\alpha_{12}}\sin 2(\lambda_2-\lambda_1). \end{aligned} \tag{39}$$

If we take

$$\alpha_{jk} = \frac{\cos(\lambda_k-\lambda_j)}{\cos(\lambda_k+\lambda_j)}\tanh(h(\lambda_k)-h(\lambda_j)), \tag{40}$$

and impose the constrains

$$\frac{\sinh(h(\lambda_j)}{\sin(2\lambda_j)} = \frac{n^2U}{4}, \qquad (j=1,2,3), \tag{41}$$

then the conditions (39) are satisfied. This proves the Yang-Baxter equaiton for the R-matrix of the 1-D $SU(n)$ Hubbard model.

Besides the YBE (23), the R-matrix (17) has the following properties:

$$R^h_{jk}(0,\lambda) = \frac{1}{\cosh(h(\lambda))}\mathcal{L}_{jk}(\lambda), \tag{42}$$

$$R^h_{jk}(\lambda_0,\lambda_0) = \mathcal{P}_{jk}, \tag{43}$$

$$R^h_{jk}(\lambda_j,\lambda_k)R^h_{kj}(\lambda_k,\lambda_j) = \rho(\lambda_j,\lambda_k)Id, \tag{44}$$

where

$$\rho(\lambda_j,\lambda_k)=\cos^2(\lambda_k-\lambda_j)\left\{\cos^2(\lambda_k-\lambda_j)-\tanh^2(h(\lambda_k)-h(\lambda_j))\right\}, \tag{45}$$

and the permutation operator is defined as

$$\mathcal{P}_{jk}=\mathcal{P}_{jk}^{(\sigma)}\mathcal{P}_{jk}^{(\tau)}. \tag{46}$$

The Yang-Baxter equation (23) implies a more general inhomogeneous model as:

$$\mathcal{T}_a(\lambda,\{\lambda_j\})=R^h_{La}(\lambda,\lambda_N)R^h_{L-1a}(\lambda,\lambda_{L-1})\cdots R^h_{1a}(\lambda,\lambda_1), \tag{47}$$

where $\lambda_j,(j=1,2,\cdots,L)$ are the inhomogeneous parameters obeying the constraints

$$\frac{\sinh(2h(\lambda_j))}{\sin(2\lambda_j)}=\frac{n^2U}{4},\qquad (j=1,2,\cdots,L). \tag{48}$$

From the Yang-Baxter equation (23), we can obtain the global Yang-Baxter relation:

$$\mathcal{T}_1(\lambda,\{\lambda_j\})\mathcal{T}_2(\mu,\{\lambda_j\})R^h_{12}(\lambda,\mu)=R^h_{12}(\lambda,\mu)\mathcal{T}_2(\mu,\{\lambda_j\})\mathcal{T}_1(\lambda,\{\lambda_j\}), \tag{49}$$

which leads to the commutativity

$$[\tau(\lambda,\{\lambda_j\}),\tau(\mu,\{\lambda_j\})]=0, \tag{50}$$

where $\tau(\lambda,\{\lambda_j\})$ is the transfer matrix of the model

$$\tau(\lambda,\{\lambda_j\})=tr_a\mathcal{T}_a(\lambda,\{\lambda_j\}). \tag{51}$$

The corresponding Hamiltonian is defined as the logarithmic derivative of the transfter matrix under all inhomogeneous parameters $\lambda_j=\lambda_0,(j=1,2,\cdots,L)$:

$$\begin{aligned}H_{\lambda_0} &= \frac{d}{d\lambda}\ln\tau(\lambda,\{\lambda_j=\lambda_0\})|_{\lambda=\lambda_0}=\tau^{-1}(\lambda_0,\{\lambda_j=\lambda_0\})\frac{d}{d\lambda}\tau(\lambda,\{\lambda_j=\lambda_0\})\\ &= \sum_{j=1}^{L}\sum_{\alpha<n}(E^{n\alpha}_{\sigma j}E^{\alpha n}_{\sigma j+1}+E^{\alpha n}_{\sigma j}E^{n\alpha}_{\sigma j+1}+E^{n\alpha}_{\tau j}E^{\alpha n}_{\tau j+1}+E^{\alpha n}_{\tau j}E^{n\alpha}_{\tau j+1})\\ &\quad+\frac{n^2U}{4\cosh(2h(\lambda_0))}\sum_{j=1}^{L}B^{(\sigma)}_{jj+1}B^{(\tau)}_{jj+1},\end{aligned} \tag{52}$$

where

$$\begin{aligned}B_{jj+1} &= \cos(2\lambda_0)(-E^{nn}_jE^{nn}_{j+1}+\sum_{\alpha,\beta<n}E^{\alpha\alpha}_jE^{\beta\beta}_{j+1})+\sin(2\lambda_0)\sum_{\alpha<n}(E^{n\alpha}_jE^{\alpha n}_{j+1}+E^{\alpha n}_jE^{n\alpha}_{j+1})\\ &\quad+\sum_{\alpha<n}(-E^{nn}_jE^{\alpha\alpha}_{j+1}+E^{\alpha\alpha}_jE^{nn}_{j+1}).\end{aligned} \tag{53}$$

The arbitrariness of the parameter λ_0 comes from the non-additive property of the spectral parameters. If we take $\lambda_0=0$, this new Hamiltonian reduces to (1).

Thus, we have obtained a new 1-D $SU(n)$ Hubbard by the Yang-Baxter equation of the R-matrix (23).

5 Conclusions

In this paper we have proved the R-matrix of the 1-D $SU(n)$ Hubbard model satisfying the Yang-Baxter equation. We notice that the tetrahedral Zamolodchikov algebra play an essential role in the proof.

In most lattice systems, the existence of R-matrix ensures the integrability and the R-matrix is isomorphic to the L-operator. Thus, the Yang-Baxter equation is a consequence of the Yang-Baxter relation $R_{12}L_1L_2 = L_2L_1R_{12}$. But, for Hubbard model, the situation is quite different. The R-matrix can not be obtained from L-operator, even if we limit to $SU(2)$ Hubbard model[15, 16]. The R-matrix satisfying the Yang-Baxter equation together with L-operator constitute the complete proof of the integrability.

For $SU(n)$ Hubbard model, the R-matrix does not isomorphic to the L-operator. This provides a method to construct a new kind of integrable system by considering the R-matrix as a L-operator (fundamental representation of same algebra). The general representation can be obtained by fusing the multi fundamental rep. (R-matrix). Therefore, one can get the full representation of the algebra in principle.

In the present paper we have derived out a new Hamitonian (52) from the R-matrix. The last term introduces a new kind of interaction. This Hamiltonian is quite different from the original one (1). It also renders a question how to find the eigenvalue of this Hamiltonian (52). We will consider it late.

In the derivation of eq. (52), we have assumed all the parameters λ_j are same λ_0. This is not necessary. The different choice will give out different Hamiltinian. On the other hand, one can consider the R-matrix as a Boltzmann weight in statistical mechanics. This provides a inhomegeneous lattice statistical medel. The partition function could be derived out in a similar way.

References

[1] E. H. Lieb and F. Y. Wu, Phys. Rev. Lett. **20** (1967) 1445.

[2] A. A. Ovchinnikov, Sov. Phys. JETP **30** (1970) 1660.

[3] G. V. Uimin and S. V. Fomichev, Sov. Phys. JETP **36** (1973) 1001.

[4] C. F. Coll, Phys. Rev. B **39** (1974) 2150.

[5] F. Woynarovich, J. Phys. C **15** (1982) 85-97; C **16** (1983) 5293.

[6] A. Klümpor, A. Schadschneider, J. Zittartz, Z. Phys. B**78** (1990) 99.

[7] M. Takahashi, Prog. Theor. Phys. **42** (1969) 4086; **43** (1970) 860, 1629.

[8] H. Shiba, Phys. Rev. B **6** (1970) 930.

[9] F. Woynarovich and K. Penc, Z. Phys. B **85** (1991) 261.

[10] M. Takahashi, Prog. Theor. Phys. **47** (1972) 69, **52** (1974) 103.

[11] T. Kowa, Prog. Theor. Phys. (1990) 655.

[12] N. Kawakami, T. Usuki, A. Okiji, Phys. Lett. A **137** (1989) 237.

[13] H. Frahm, V. E. Korepin, Phys. Rev. B **42** (1990) 10573, B **43** (1991) 5653.

[14] J. Carmelo, P. Horsch, A. A. Ovchinnikov, Phys. Rev. B **45** (1992) 7899.

[15] B. S. Shastry, Phys. Rev. Lett. **56** (1986) 1529; Phys. Rev. Lett. **56** (1986) 2453; J. Stat. Phys. **50** (1988) 57.

[16] E. Olmedilla and M. Wadati, Phys. Rev. Lett. **60** (1987) 1595.

[17] R. H. Yue and T. Deguchi, J. Phys. A: Math. gen. bf 30 (1997) 849.

[18] M. J. Martins, P. B. Ramos, Nucl. Phys. B **522** [FS] (1998) 413.

[19] H. Asakawa and M. Suzuki, J. Phys. A **29** (1995) 225.

[20] T. Deguchi and R. H. Yue, *Exact Solution of 1-D Hubbard Model with Open Boundary Conditions and the Conformal Dimensions under Boundary Magnetic Fields* (1996) OCHAPP-84, cond-mat/9704138.

[21] M. Shiroishi and M. Wadati, J. Phys. Soc. Jpn. **65** (1996) 1983; J. Phys. Soc. Jpn. **66** (1997) 1.

[22] Z. Maassarani and P. Mathieu, Nucl. Phys. B **517** (1998) 395.

[23] Z. Maassarani, Phys. Lett. A **239** (1998) 187.

[24] Z. Maassarani, Mod. Phys. Lett. B **12** (1998) 51.

[25] M. J. Martins, Phys. Lett. A **247** (1998) 218.

[26] R. Yue and R. Sasaki, J. Phys. Soc. Jpn. **67** (1998) 2967.

[27] B. Y. Hou, D. T. Peng and R. H. Yue, Nucl. Phys. B **575** (2000) 561.

[28] C. N. Yang and S. Zhang, Mod. Phys. Lett. B **4** (1990) 759.

[29] F. H. L. Eβler, V. E. Korepin and K. Schoutens, Nucl. Phys. B **384** (1992) 431.

[30] C. N. Yang, Phys. Rev. Lett. **19** (1967) 1372.

[31] M. Shiroishi and M. Wadati, J. Phys. Soc. Jpn. **64** (1995) 57.

[32] M. Shiroishi and M. Wadati, J. Phys. Soc. Jpn. **64** (1995) 2795.

[33] M. Shiroishi and M. Wadati, J. Phys. Soc. Jpn. **64** (1995) 4598.

[34] I. G. Korepanov, Comm. Math. Phys. **154** (1993) 85.